

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,242	09/08/2003	Nobuhiro Yasui	03500.017136.	8855
5514	7590 10/19/2004		EXAMINER	
	ICK CELLA HARPE	RICKMAN, HOLLY C		
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/656,242	YASUI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Holly Rickman	1773				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a in - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed  /s will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133)				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02	? August 2004.					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ T						
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> is/are pending in the application	on					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-7 and 21-50</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 September 2003</u> i		ted to by the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	-	•				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		. ,				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		, ,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign      a) All b) Some * c) None of:      1. Certified copies of the priority docume      2. Certified copies of the priority docume      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume      application from the International Bures*  * See the attached detailed Office action for a light	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applicationity documents have been received and (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	·					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/8/04.10/30/03.		atent Application (PTO-152)				
Patent and Trademark Office						

Art Unit: 1773

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 8-20, in the reply filed on 8/2/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search of Group II will necessarily include the subject matter of Group I and vice-versa. This is not found persuasive because it has been held that even though product-by-process claims are limited and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. Thus, the Examiner maintains that the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process from that set forth in claims 1-7, 38, and 48-49.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

## Claim Objections

2. Claims 11-12 and 17-20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/656,242

Art Unit: 1773

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 8 and 13-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kikitsu et al. (US 6602620).

Kikitsu et al. disclose a magnetic recording medium having a porous body formed from a materials such as C or SiO wherein the columnar pores are filled with a magnetic 'functional' material. The reference teaches that the distance between pores is a minimum of 2 nm (pore diameter = 2nm, thus, distance to pore center = 1nm and the distance between pores is 1 nm). See col. 10, lines 5-15; col. 11, lines 36-47).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kikitsu et al. (US 6602620).

Kikitsu et al. teach all of the limitations of the claims as set forth above.

The reference does not expressly disclose the ratio of the surrounding area of the functional device to the total area which includes the surrounding area and the columnar members. However, the "columnar members" refer to the process limitation in claim 8,

Application/Control Number: 10/656,242

Art Unit: 1773

from which 9 and 10 depend, requiring that a functional material is filled into a porous body obtained by *removing* the columnar members from a structure. The columnar members *are not present in the final product*. Thus, the process limitation set forth in claim 9 does not structurally distinguish the final product set forth in the claims from Kikitsu et al.

It has been held that even though product-by-process claims are limited and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Likewise, the particular material used for the "columnar members" does not affect the structure of the function device that results when the columnar members are removed and filled with a functional materials. Thus, the limitation set forth in claim 10 directed to the use of Al for the columnar members does not structurally distinguish over the prior art in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (571) 272-1514. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Holly Rickman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773

hr October 14, 2004